



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

are purely speculative. The demand for capital for investment in such values is a drain upon the productive resources. It cripples industry, it reacts upon the municipal and state bond market.

The demand of the land mortgages strikes at the foundations of production, and grows continually through increased additions and turning over. The too heavy expense for this purpose means a grave and detrimental obstacle to Germany, while no other country has to carry an indebtedness approaching this. (P. 261.)

As long as such an unreasonable amount of mortgages are on the market, it is no wonder that the conditions of our public loans are more unfavorable than those of other nations and that new issues find such bad receptions. The mortgage absorbs everything. (P. 201.)

The difficulties through which Germany is at present passing, both in regard to the perplexing housing problem in the industrial centers, and the insecurity of certain banking establishments through their close connection with land speculation, give an added pertinency to the author's discussion. He has stated the question squarely; he also endeavors to point out the remedies. If the individual owner and the business community are not responsible for this form of speculation, but the legal and administrative institutions (p. 264), then a thorough and scientific investigation into the conditions is necessary to find the way out. It is such an investigation that Dr. Eberstadt has made for Germany. His work is of more than local or national interest. His data are, of course, based upon the conditions of Germany, but analogies can be drawn and principles will be found that are helpful in a similar survey of other countries. Even now, the book will cause the economists of other countries to ponder whether the causes that, in the estimation of the author, have brought a sudden check to the German prosperity are really at hand and will have the same effects upon the rising prosperity of other commercial countries.

S. G. LINDHOLM.

NEW YORK.

L'irrigation, ses conditions géographiques, ses modes et son organisation dans la Péninsule Ibérique et dans l'Afrique du nord. By JEAN BRUNHES. Paris: C. Naud, 1902. Pp. xvii+518.

IN this work Professor Brunhes studies irrigation in Spain, Algeria, Tunis, and Egypt from a single point of view—the influence of geographical conditions on the organizations controlling the use of water. The object of the study as brought out in his introduction is as follows:

To ascertain and establish, if possible, in an exact, definite manner in what measure certain economic facts of the organization and regulation of water are more or less dependent upon natural conditions.

It is not the purpose either to prepare a catalogue of the places where irrigation is practiced or a list of the works that have been built; we wish to study irrigation as a practice . . . that is to say, our sole object has been to ascertain the status of the irrigation problem and how it has been solved—what ideas prevailed in regard to irrigation and in what manner, by what various types of organization, have the acts of man corresponded to natural conditions.

In another place the question is stated in another way:

Is it possible to establish any connection between the geographical characteristics which distinguish a given region and the various forms of organization which in that region have regulated and controlled the use of water?

In discussing the relationship between natural conditions and the organizations controlling the use of water the author presents a greater volume of facts regarding the countries studied than is brought together in any other one work on the subject, and its greatest value lies in this mass of information, rather than in what may be termed its philosophical features, although these have their value.

The main thesis of the book, to bear out which a mass of evidence is submitted, is that the greater the scarcity of water, the greater is the necessity for regulation, and therefore the organizations providing this regulation depend upon the geographical conditions which produce the scarcity. Probably no one will take issue with the statement that the scarcity necessitates regulation; almost every American who has written on the subject of public control of the water supply in recent years has stated this fact. But is Professor Brunhes right in calling scarcity of water a geographical condition? Is not demand as much a factor in producing scarcity as supply? That it is is clearly shown in the discussion of Granada, although the author overlooks the fact, owing to his rigid adherence to this point of view. He says that in Granada there has been no general control of the water supply, because it was ample, but that the introduction of sugar-beet culture is creating an increased demand for water and a consequent scarcity which makes organization necessary. It is plain that the scarcity in this case is the direct result of an economic change. The geographical conditions have remained unchanged. Again, in the discussion of Egypt, the change from the old system of agriculture under which but one crop per year was raised, and that depending on the Nile flood, to the pres-

ent system of perennial irrigation has increased the demand for water and made necessary the absolute control of the Nile exercised by the British. Here again scarcity is the immediate result of economic changes, and any changes in the regulation of the Nile must be the result of these new economic conditions, since none of the natural conditions have been changed. On his own presentation of facts, the author is only half right in making scarcity a geographical condition.

There is, however, value in his suggestions that these conditions be taken into account in establishing rules for the regulation of the use of water. There is no necessity for such regulation where the supply meets the needs of all, and any systems established to control water in such places will fall into disuse or be a useless burden and annoyance to the water-users. This has been recognized in some of our western states. Utah and Nevada each passed laws providing for the control of their streams by the county commissioners of their several counties, each board to decide whether such control was necessary in its county.

The more important question of the influence of natural conditions upon the form of the organization controlling the use of water is not so fully treated as the general question of the extent of organization. The forms found in the countries studied are very fully described, but the extent to which these forms are dictated by natural conditions is not brought out. In fact the author seems to be blind to every consideration except *extent* of organization. This can best be brought out by reference to his comparison of the Valencian organization in Spain and the English organization in Egypt. In Valencia the water-users under each canal are organized into a syndicate, and elect biennially a board of directors and a superintendent. The superintendents of all canals form a water court, which has absolute authority in times of scarcity to control the whole water supply. In Egypt the English officials, in whose choice the water-users have no voice, have just as absolute control of the water supply, and can dictate what crops shall be watered and what crops left to burn for lack of water in times of scarcity. In discussing the Egyptian system Professor Brunhes says:

Notwithstanding the dimensions of Egypt, notwithstanding the difficulties of a general organization, notwithstanding the absence of historical traditions touching this matter, notwithstanding the natural tide of modern European ideas which inspire the Egyptian government, notwithstanding the dissimilarity between the actual political system and the ancient systems, we find born today in Egypt a system and an organization which are altogether analogous, in their object and in their effect, to the system and the organization of water in the old garden-spot of Valencia.

As regards form, these two organizations represent the extremes—one is purely co-operative, and in the other the farmers have no voice. And as to their object, the only common point is the completeness of the control of the water supply. In the Valencian organization the people control the water supply for the purpose of getting the most out of it for themselves—the farmers. In Egypt the English control the use of the Nile for the sake of getting the most out of it for themselves—the alien rulers. The effects are equally divergent. On the whole the evidence given goes to show that the form of organization depends more on social conditions and political ideals than on geographical conditions. This also is brought out in the discussion of Egypt. The French, who were in Egypt before the English, according to the author,

could scarcely become despotic organizers of the water supply. The English, who arrived from India, found themselves prepared by habit and experience rather than by nature and temperament for their conception of an irrigation service altogether independent and strongly centralized. . . . With the economic ideas called liberal, which have so long prevailed without opposition in our official schools, a Frenchman cannot conceive of the rôle of the sovereign irrigation service as anything but a usurpation of power. England, pretended country of liberal ideas, which has always had the talent of upholding in the world the theories which would best serve her interests, has never troubled herself with liberalism toward strange peoples, and she had no inconvenient traditions against planting herself in Egypt and there becoming the mistress of the Nile, the mistress of the water.

The Egyptian system may then be called the result of English ideas. The result of French ideas may be seen in Algeria and Tunis, where the government has declared itself the owner of the water and helps the people to build works, but leaves the control of these works to syndicates similar to those found in Spain. A study of American irrigation would show the same thing. An absolute government control such as exists in Egypt, which recognized no rights in water-users, could not exist in this country because our whole system of government and all our ideals are based on the rights of the individual.

Yet the form of organization best fitted to any locality does depend quite largely on geographical conditions. If an isolated locality has a water supply independent of any other locality, a simple co-operative organization will suffice for its needs. But on large streams, where the use in one locality affects the supply of other localities perhaps hundreds of miles away, these simple organizations will not answer because the localities are too far apart for their people to work together con-

veniently. Some power superior to both must step in and control the division of the stream between them. But the form which this general control will take, and should take, depends more largely upon social and political conditions than upon geographical conditions. Professor Brunhes has done the world a service in calling attention to the relation between geographical conditions and the principles which should rule in the control of the water supply, but, on the whole, he seems to have attributed too great an influence to these natural conditions.

As has been stated, this work gives a great mass of valuable information. All of this is of great interest to Americans, because our irrigation institutions have not yet become fixed, and the lessons learned by centuries of experience in these older countries can be applied to our problems. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book just at present is that dealing with the French public works in Tunis and Algeria, because our own government has just started upon similar works. The policy of the French in Algeria is shown by the following quotation :

The state is to build the greater part of the works, at its expense ; on the other hand, it is not to undertake such works until the interested colonists have demonstrated, by the organization of a syndicate organization, that they recognize the unity of their interests and will assure the means of serving the same. The state demands co-operation from this association to the extent that the latter shall stand part of the first cost of installing dams, canals, etc., their proportion varying according to the case, and the state agrees to pay at least four-fifths of the expenses. In return, it exacts that the syndicate shall pay all expenses for subsequent repairs. . . .

The Service of Irrigated Farming of Tunis appears to have adopted and to follow increasingly that which we have called, in connection with Algeria, the policy of syndicate associations. The state wisely bears an important part of the expense of conserving the waters and supplying the canals, but on condition that the syndicate associations, regularly organized, shall bear the remainder of the expense.

According to the decree of September 15, 1897, the state even agrees to bear all the expense of establishing works, but on condition that the " syndicate should guarantee to reimburse the state for the amount advanced, payable in annuities not to exceed a period of twenty-five years."

The plan advanced by the secretary of the interior for the construction of irrigation works in this country is in principle the same as that adopted by the French in Algeria and Tunis. In neither country has the plan been in operation long enough to test its efficiency. The French plan is by far the more liberal in its details ; the United States

law requires that the water-users shall repay the entire cost of the works in ten years, while in Algeria the French government meets at least four-fifths of the cost of the works, and in Tunis gives the syndicates twenty-five years in which to repay the cost of works built by the government. It is the opinion of many in this country that farmers cannot pay the cost of government works in ten years, and the French are evidently of the same opinion. It is very likely that this provision of our law will have to be amended before government works will be financially successful.

RAY P. TEELE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Human Nature and the Social Order. By CHARLES HORTON COOLEY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902. Pp. viii + 404.

PROFESSOR COOLEY'S conception of social relations is based upon a different theory of personality from that hitherto prevailing in social philosophy. The current sociological doctrine, he thinks, is a veiled materialism, seeing that it regards society as an association of human organisms, rather than as an association of persons. As these organisms are plainly separate, the only way of cementing them into a social aggregate is to assume some special trait—sociability, altruism, or the like. Professor Cooley, on the other hand, insists that social order is a matter of conduct, conduct is a matter of motive, and motive springs from "personal ideas," *i. e.*, ideas of persons. The problem of social order can be nothing else than a psychical problem, *how to harmonize selves*, whereas it has been conceived as a physiological problem, *how to harmonize organisms*. "My association with you consists in the relation between my idea of you and the rest of my mind." "The immediate social reality is the personal idea." Society itself "is a relation among personal ideas." Persons "are not separable and mutually exclusive, like physical bodies," but interpenetrate one another. "Self and other do not exist as mutually exclusive social facts," and hence do not need to be held together by a cement of altruism. "We do not think 'I' except with reference to a complementary thought of other persons." The false antithesis of "society and individual," "egoism and *alter*," arises from conceiving personal ideas as having the separateness of material bodies.

Personal opposition is not the collision of two organisms, but the incompatibility of two self-ideas. The tap-root of evil is feebleness of